UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,351	01/19/2006	Takashi Kikukawa	890050.537USPC	2186
500 7590 10/01/2008 SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC 701 FIFTH AVE SUITE 5400 SEATTLE, WA 98104			EXAMINER	
			SASINOWSKI, ANDREW	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4163	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/565,351	KIKUKAWA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	ANDREW J. SASINOWSKI	4163			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
Period for Reply		•			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>19 January 2006</u> . 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final. 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the ore Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oregin of the property of t	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/19/2006, 12/15/2006, 3/6/2008, 3/21/20	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 008. 6) Other:	ate			



Application No.

Application/Control Number: 10/565,351 Page 2

Art Unit: 2629

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is over the 150 word limit. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory

double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1 – 14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim claims 1 – 9 of copending Application No. 10/561096. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims are merely broader than or constitute obvious variations of the copending claims. Note that the claimed ranges overlap with those set forth in the copending claims, and thus a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists between the claims.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW J. SASINOWSKI whose telephone number is (571)270-5883. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30 to 5:00, EST.

Application/Control Number: 10/565,351 Page 4

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Robinson can be reached on (571)272-2319. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AJS

/Mark A. Robinson/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4163